

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/599,163	06/22/2000	David M. Oliver	005-905-330 7578 EXAMINER		
20433 7	590 10/06/2004				
BLODGETT BLODGETT			NGUYEN, NGA B		
43 HIGHLAND STREET WORCESTER, MA 016092797			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		3628		
			DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				5
Advisory Action		09/599,163	OLIVER ET AL.	フ
		Examiner	Art Unit	
The MAIL ING DATE of this course		Nga B. Nguyen	3628	
THE REPLY FILED 16 August 2004 FAI Therefore, further action by the applicant final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may ocondition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37	LS TO PLACE T is required to avenly be either: (1) Notice of Appea	THIS APPLICATION IN CONDIT oid abandonment of this application of the condition of the con	TION FOR ALLOWA ation. A proper repl h places the applica	ANCE. y to a ation in
<u>P</u>	ERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months f b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the r no event, however, will the statutory per ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 fee have been filed is the date for purposes of dete fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the	mailing date of this A riod for reply expire I FIRST REPLY WAS CFR 1.136(a). The emining the period of e expiration date of	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the approperation of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final-	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action: or
(2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term ad 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on	ljustment. See 37 C	FR 1.704(b).		ction, even if
37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension	thereof (37 CFF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o	f the appeal.	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will n	ot be entered be	ecause:		•
(a) they raise new issues that wo	uld require furthe	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new ma	atter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place issues for appeal; and/or	the application ir	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	mplifying the
(d) ☐ they present additional claims NOTE:	s without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	S .
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the	e following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim canceling the non-allowable claim	(s) would (s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or a application in condition for allowan	c)⊡ request for ice because: <u>Se</u>	reconsideration has been consi	dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be raised by the Examiner in the final	considered becarejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the propose explanation of how the new or amount of the propose of th	sed amendmente ended claims wo	(s) a)⊡ will not be entered or b) ould be rejected is provided belo	☐ will be entered a w or appended.	and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will	be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 35-41.				
Claim(s) withdrawn from considera				
8. The drawing correction filed on				
9. Note the attached Information Disc	losure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·	
10. ☐ Other:		Mgar	lguyen	-

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The evidence submitted is insufficient to overcome the priority date of the patent reference (Teper et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,815,665). Applicants do not claim priority to a specific date. But, rather, the disclosures of applicants are dated disclosures referring to the Clickshare Corporation and/or Newshare Corporation and their activities that, while related to applicants' invention, do not cleary establish due diligence in the prosecution of their invention from a date prior to reduction to practice of the Teper et al. reference to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice of applicants' invention.